

1 Morris J. Baller, #048928
2 Roberta L. Steele, #188198
3 Joseph E. Jaramillo, #178566
4 Nina Rabin, #229403
5 GOLDSTEIN, DEMCHAK, BALLER,
6 BORGEN & DARDARIAN
7 300 Lakeside Dr., Suite 1000
8 Oakland, CA 94612
9 (510) 763-9800 (telephone)
10 (510) 835-1417 (telefax)

11 Paul Strauss, #153937
12 Robert S. Libman, #139283
13 Nancy Maldonado, *pro hac vice*
14 MINER, BARNHILL & GALLAND
15 14 W. Erie Street
16 Chicago, IL 60610
17 (312) 751-1170 (telephone)
18 (312) 751-0438 (fax)

19 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LARRY HOUSTON, et al., on behalf of
themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CINTAS CORPORATION,

Defendant

Case No. C05-03145

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER
EXTENDING DATE BY WHICH
DEFENDANT MUST ANSWER OR
OTHERWISE PLEAD TO THE
COMPLAINT**

STIPULATION

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between the undersigned
counsel for plaintiffs and defendant, as follows:

1. WHEREAS, defendant must answer the complaint or otherwise file a motion under Rule 12 on or before October 11, 2005 in this action;

2. WHEREAS, on September 6, 2005, counsel for defendant notified counsel for plaintiffs that if they did not withdraw their complaint within 21 days, defendant would move to dismiss or compel their claims to arbitration and also seek an award of sanctions;

3. WHEREAS, on September 19, 2005, the Court approved the parties' Stipulation and [Proposed] Order to Have Cases Related and ordered that this case be transferred and reassigned to the Honorable Jeffrey S. White, who had pending before him the earlier related case of Ramirez v. Cintas Corp., Case No. C04-0281-JSW;

4. WHEREAS, Cintas has filed a motion to dismiss or compel arbitration of plaintiff James Morgan's claims in Ramirez v. Cintas Corp., which is scheduled for hearing on October 14, 2005; and

5. WHEREAS, the parties agree that the Court's ruling on the motion to dismiss or compel arbitration of plaintiff Morgan's claims in Ramirez v. Cintas Corp., depending on what state law is applied by the Court, may cause either of them to reassess their positions regarding the arbitration agreements signed by the plaintiffs in Houston v. Cintas Corp.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties request that the Court order as follows:

A. The date on which Cintas must file an answer or motion under Rule 12 in response to the complaint in this action is extended until 21 days after the Court issues a ruling in the case of Ramirez v. Cintas Corp. on the motion to dismiss or compel arbitration of plaintiff Morgan's claims; and

B. The date on which Cintas may file a motion for sanctions under Rule 11 in this action is extended until 21 days after the Court issues a ruling in the case of Ramirez v. Cintas Corp. on the motion to dismiss or compel arbitration of plaintiff Morgan's claims.

Dated: September 21, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Morris J. Baller, #048928

Robert L. Steele, #188198

Joseph E. Jaramillo, #178566

Nina Rabin, #229403

**GOLDSTEIN, DEMCHAK, BALLER, BORGEN &
DARDARIAN**

DARKEEN
300 Lakeside Drive, Suite 1000

Oakland, CA 94612

Saskia, S.H.
(510) 763-9800

(510) 835-1417 (fax)

(510) 655-1417 (fax).

Paul Strauss, #153937

Robert S. Libman, #139283

Nancy Maldonado, *pro hac vice*

MINER, BARNH

14 W. Erie Street

Chicago, IL 60610

(312) 751-1170 (telephone)

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

DATED: 8/21/05

~~Nancy L. Abell (SB# 88785)
Elena Baca (SB# 160564)
Heather A. Morgan (SB# 177425)
Joseph W. Deng (SB# 179320)~~
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky &
Walker LLP
515 South Flower Street
Twenty-Fifth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2228
Telephone: (213) 683-6000
Facsimile: (213) 627-0705

**ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT
CINTAS CORPORATION**

ORDER

The Court, having reviewed the record and Stipulation herein, finds that good cause exists and hereby ORDERS as follows:

A. The date on which Cintas must file an answer or motion under Rule 12 in response to the complaint in this action is extended until 21 days after the Court issues a ruling in the case of Ramirez v. Cintas Corp. to dismiss or compel arbitration of plaintiff Morgan's claims; and

B. The date on which Cintas may file a motion for sanctions under Rule 11 in this action is extended until 21 days after the Court issues a ruling in the case of Ramirez v. Cintas Corp. to dismiss or compel arbitration of plaintiff Morgan's claims.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 21, 2005

THE HONORABLE JEFFREY S. WHITE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE